DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 836 JC 720 080

TITLE	Survey Report of State-Funded College Programs for "Disadvantaged" Students in Massachusetts.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
PUB DATE	1 Mar 72
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education Programs; Counseling Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Financial Support; *Junior Colleges; Low Ability Students; *Remedial Programs; State Aid; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This report was prepared to provide information on the operation and management of state-funded educational programs for the disadvantaged in Massachusetts institutions of high education. Schools surveyed included ten of the 13 community colleges and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Detailed information was collected from each school on recruitment, academic programs, support services (e.g. tutoring, counseling, placement, and housing), financial aid, staffing, planning and policy-making, and funding. Institutions differed in the criteria used (financial, academic, or cultural factors) to identify disadvantaged students, and whether they sought out potential students in the community or identified disadvantaged students from among those already enrolled. Four kinds of academic programs were identified: (1) remedial "package" courses that all program students take; (2) enrollment in regular classes with tutorial assistance available; (3) a reduced load of regular courses with the addition of study skills labs, special courses and tutoring; and (4) a summer preparatory program. The report concludes with some specific recommendations and generalizations about education for the disadvantaged. (LP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 060836

Survey Report

Of State-Funded College Programs For "Disadvantaged" Students in Massachusetts

Prepared by

Higher Education Center
Field Research Group
(Task Force One)

School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst

March 1, 1972

JC 720 080

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 19 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

February 25, 1972

Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis, Provost
Massachusetts State College System
65 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Dear Dr. Dennis:

The attached report has been prepared by our Field Research Group of the Higher Education Center, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, to provide information for decision-making in the Massachusetts State College System. It includes program information gathered during site visits to ten community colleges and interviews with CCEBS program officers on this campus.

We have endeavored to document all potentially useful information in the major categories of program operations and management. This report is hardly exhaustive, we know, but if it at all reflects what our investigation taught us, it will serve its purpose. We now know that such programs can provide the key to change that is so necessary if our colleges are to become equal to the demands of diversity.

Beyond its immediate purpose, this effort will hopefully signal the kinds of information sharing that serve to unify the sectors of higher education in the Commonwealth. In this vein, we are pleased to report that all key persons whom we asked expressed a willingness to meet with State College personnel to share their knowledge and answer questions. This, we submit, would seem to hold promise as a means for informing and sensitizing persons who are to be involved in program planning and operation.

Respectfully submitted,

William Lauroesch
Associate Professor
Higher Education Center

WL/ssm
Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST

HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER
F. Thomas Clark, Jr., Director

FIELD RESEARCH GROUP
William Lauroesch, Coordinator

Task Force One

Linda Reisser, Research Team Leader

Anne Bryant, Report Editor

Participants

Herbert Bryan

Philip Chanin

Allen Davis

David Hoffman

Terry Mollner

Michael Schwartz

Becky Wong

Consultants

Dallas Darland

Coby Smith

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	1
Recruitment	2
Academic Programs	5
Support Services	9
Financial Aid	20
Staffing	24
Planning and Policy-Making	25
Funding	26
Recommendations	28
Issues and Exploratory Questions	30

PREFACE

The purpose of this investigation has been to provide useful information for decision makers. Specifically, it has been an attempt to collect information about the organization, management, and conduct of existing state funded programs for "disadvantaged students" in two sectors of Massachusetts higher education that will inform and direct the inaugeration of such programs in the third sector.

This study was never formally commissioned by any individual or agency. It simply grew out of the pointed observation on the part of the Provost and Director of the Massachusetts State College System that it would be helpful to him to have the shared wisdom of others in the Commonwealth who had launched programs for the disadvantaged in higher education as he embarked upon the programs in his own sector. Two professors from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Higher Education Center in the School of Education, were the audience on the occasion of the Provost's remark. We thought it a good question, and we decided to have at answering it. Justifications for the undertaking have abounded after the fact:

1. It afforded an opportunity for the newly formed Higher Education Center to achieve this ability among institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth.

2. It was an appropriate research project, which could be undertaken modestly without dependence on external funding.

3. It contained the elements for an excellent learning experience.

4. It enabled the Higher Education Center to engage in the service role enunciated in the report on the "Future University of Massachusetts."

These, albeit self-serving reasons, were seen as ample justification for initiating the project. The real significance of the undertaking, we later found, lay well beyond our initial purposes.

We lay no claim to the clairvoyance that could have anticipated what we have come to see as a real significance of this study, nor do we believe that all the ramifications of that significance have been fully explored in this modest attempt. What is really significant, we believe, is what we have learned about the crucial role of programs for the

"disadvantaged" in effecting genuine and permanent change in institutions. If there is any one measure of the efficacy of such programs, it does not lie in the accomplishments of a group apart, it lies rather in the changed posture of a total institution both in attitude toward new populations and the capacity to respond to their needs.

W.L.

I. OVERVIEW

A task force of graduate students in the Higher Education Center developed a set of questions about programs for the disadvantaged. Teams of interviewers visited ten of the thirteen community colleges in Massachusetts--Berkshire, Bristol, Cape Cod, Greenfield, Holyoke, Massasoit, Northern Essex, North Shore, Quinsigamond, and Springfield Technical. The CCEBS Program (Committee for Collegiate Education of Black Students) at UMass, Amherst, was also studied. The team regretted that lack of time precluded going to Mass. Bay, Middlesex, and Mount Wachusett.

Members of the task force sought to record basic information about how state funds had been used to help disadvantaged students, including academic programming recruitment, support services, and funding. Most information was provided by administrators--program directors, financial officers, and counselors, rather than by students involved in the program. These administrators were most generous with their time. We regret being unable to augment this information with student perceptions because we believe that they would have added a valuable dimension. We simply did not have the time or resources to make this extension.

This paper attempts to summarize the patterns of organization and services that programs provided, as well as our perception of issues that emerged. It is meant to stimulate discussion and creative thinking with regard to both old and new programs.

One of our first questions concerned the identification of "disadvantaged" students. We asked whether the colleges used cultural, regional, financial, or academic considerations in their operational definitions. Virtually all of the institutions surveyed agreed that academic deficiency and financial hardship were the most important factors. Consequently, almost every program had for its goals the easing of financial difficulties for students who would otherwise be unable to attend college, and the development of enough basic skills to enable a student to perform satisfactorily in regular college courses.

Widespread dissatisfaction with the term "disadvantaged" is not accompanied by the proffering of a generally acceptable substitute. This is neither here nor there. What we do need to ponder, however, is the impact of the characteristics that classify individuals (i.e., atypical academic and socio-economic backgrounds as defined by the majority culture) on those individuals. In a loose sense, this may be the heart of the problem. Where institutional response to atypical students remains atypical, those students remain shrouded by atypical identification--the identical burden they carried throughout earlier experience.

II. RECRUITMENT

Although there was general agreement about the definition of "disadvantaged," two different patterns emerged with regard to where the definition was applied.

A. Some programs recruited students from inside the institution. Typically, students who were on probation, about to be suspended, or newly admitted but with minimum qualifying grades were identified by the Admissions Office and referred to the program.

B. Other programs tried to contact groups in the community who would not ordinarily think of the college as an institution which would accept them, give them financial aid, or serve their particular needs (e.g., for learning English as a second language, passing the High School Equivalency Exam, etc.). Methods of recruitment here included:

1. Active recruitment through community organizations, such as anti-poverty agencies, Neighborhood Youth Corps, welfare agencies, Adult Learning Centers, etc.

2. Sending speakers to High Schools or seeking referrals through High School guidance counselors (The CCEBS program at UMass finds this to be an increasingly reliable procedure as rapport with these institutions increases).

3. Implementation of outreach programs to publicize the college service function (e.g., teaching courses in community settings rather than on campus).

In order to implement a policy of freedom of access to higher education and a true commitment to serving all the citizens of the state, it seems obvious that college personnel

will have to become familiar with the learning experiences, values, goals, and interests of new student populations. New groups will have to be brought to the college, but before recruitment begins, it seems important that the college develop a constructive philosophy and appropriate educational resources.

As Patricia Cross says in "The New Students of the 70's":

> Almost all special programs presently offered new students can be classified under three major headings. There are remedial courses to correct academic 'deficiencies,' counseling programs to correct motivational 'deficiencies,' and financial aids to correct financial 'deficiencies.' The point is not that such programs are not necessary (although I question the methods and emphases of some), it is rather that they are not sufficient. To date, we have devoted no major attention at all to seeking out and capitalizing on the strengths of new students.[1]

The task force found this pattern among the ten community colleges, with some exceptions. As the study progressed, we as researchers found ourselves becoming increasingly locked into the vocabulary and conceptualizations used by these kinds of programs. We found a tendency to use language and thinking which expressed more concern for subject matter than for students, which continued to define these new students in terms of deficiencies rather than strengths, and to imply that success is ensured when individuals begin to perform like the

---

[1]K. Patricia Cross, "The New Students of the 70's," The Research Reporter, Vol. VI, No. 4 (1971), pp. 3-4.

"regular" students. We believe that this is a dangerous tendency which should be kept in mind as programs are reviewed.

III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Almost all programs studied were variations on the remedial theme. We have divided the academic components of those programs surveyed into four categories. We are considering academic programs which apply to students with full-time status and who are actively pursuing a degree, as opposed to special courses that may have been designed to serve the needs of groups in the community. The following summaries are excerpted from field reports.

A. A remedial "package" of courses that all program students take (differentiated from the regular curriculum)

1. The Student Development Program at Springfield Technical Community College is designed "for those students who need special assistance before entering the regular career programs . . . ." In operation, the Admissions Office reviews applications and recommends the program for students who "seem not capable of succeeding in the regular program." A special curriculum includes three courses for which program students are given credit, even though the credits do not count toward graduation.

> a. Remedial Reading and Study Skills: ". . . using programmed instruction, graded level high interest reading material and audio-visual aids . . . . The formalized classroom lecture is replaced by individualized instruction."
>
> b. Introductory College Physical Science: "We found that students had the intelligence but were not used to relating ideas to each other. They learned better from concrete things rather than abstract concepts."
>
> Physics Teacher

c. Mathematics: an 18-volume set of programmed texts from the New York Institute of Technology.

d. An introductory course in the discipline which the student believes he will choose as a major at STCC -- "to develop a familiarity with the particular career choice he plans to pursue at the College." In most cases, this course is part of a degree program and counts toward graduation.

2. North Shore Community College used a similar approach in its Motivation to Education Program, which was based on an interdisciplinary core curriculum. The Program makes it possible for the student to earn college credit by participating in the program. The fifteen credit-hours minimum avoids limiting the program to being merely remedial and also adds incentive for the student to complete this program and continue into the regular one. The fifteen credit-hours minimum is based on a full year of study; however, students making sufficient progress are able to enter the regular college curriculum after one semester of study.

3. The Discovery Program at Northern Essex Community College is a one semester program, also of special courses for program students, who receive a semester's credit upon completion.

B. Enrollment in regular classes with tutorial assistance available

Tutorial assistance was offered at a number of colleges, and will be discussed more fully in the next section.

The Tutorial Assistance Program for Probationary Students at Massasoit "affords tutoring to freshman and sophomore students on probationary status or in danger of being placed on probationary status. This is usually an individualized, student-to-student relationship for short periods of time, which has been found to be the most effective method of helping students who would otherwise not receive academic tutoring of this nature. The type of student generally selected for participation in this program is one who finds difficulty in one or two academic areas but has indicated ability and performance in other academic areas."

C. A reduced load of regular courses with an added component of study skills labs, special courses, and tutoring

1. The "classroom phase" of Greenfield's Spring Project has students carry lighter loads than other students. In addition they have two two-hour learning labs per week,

where four faculty, released half-time, work with students on an intensive level in academic assistance, guided by the directors. Originally, the four rotated among the labs, working in their special areas (math, sociology and anthropology, psychology, and history), but it was found to be more effective to have one faculty member stay with one group on a permanent basis to build stronger relationships and break down the omniscient teacher myth.

2. Holyoke provides its 30 students, who are enrolled in the regular program, with the option of taking a reduced load, a special English course, which lasts for five hours per week instead of the regular three, and a reading-writing skills course.

3. The CCEBS students at the University are incorporated into the regular curriculum. A number of other services are provided for the CCEBS students by the program and the students themselves, including skills development and tutoring programs.

4. Cape Cod Community College provides its students with a tutorial program, and some special courses and skills development, while they take the rest of their program within the regular curriculum:

a. A special English 101 course designed and taught by Mrs. Virginia Harvey (director of the program) enrolls 25 of the tutorial project's 50 students. The course meets three times each week, plus two hours in the skill development center. The first six weeks of the course are spent in orientation, with no English curriculum taught. The students in this course get full credit for English 101. Some of the students who have difficulty in this special 101 course are allowed to switch to non-credit English with no marks against them.

b. All fifty of the project students are enrolled in a special non-credit high school algebra class.

c. These fifty students were discouraged from taking difficult courses or courses with heavy reading. Only one was allowed to take science and only two were allowed to take history.

d. Fourteen of these fifty students received academic warnings at mid-semester.

D. A summer preparatory program to build skills, acquaint students with the college and increase their self-confidence, leading to enrollment in regular classes for the academic year

1. Quinsigamond enrolls its students in the regular program following the Summer Program:

a. Fifteen Spanish-speaking students enrolled in "English as a Second Language," "English Communication Skills," and "Problems of the Community," as a twelve-week program.

b. A total of fifteen disadvantaged students were enrolled in "English Communication Skills" and "Problems of the Community." The seminar on "Problems of the Community" was designed to prepare students for admission to the College in the fall, and to acquaint the students with the community as well as the college.

2. Since 1967, Bristol Community College has conducted Project Connect during the summer to prepare marginal students for full-time enrollment in the fall. This is a self-supporting program, thus meaning that limited financial aid can be made available. Connect includes the use of learning groups, with extensive counseling and support services. Eighty-five percent of the students in Connect have gone into full-time day program, with follow-up and additional tutoring and support given throughout the regular year. The state funds received through the Regional Board were used to help establish Project Success in Fall 1971. Success is an academically-based program for students who are identified as disadvantaged in this area. There were between 60 and 70 students, half from Connect, half identified through admissions procedures. This is an intensive program, individualized where necessary.

A number of questions emerge from these summaries:

1. Should all "disadvantaged" students be placed in a prescribed number of remedial courses? If not, how can a program be designed to suit the particular needs of each individual?

2. If remedial work is necessary, should it be offered as "sub-college level" work for which no degree credit is earned?

3. How important is it to integrate students into the "mainstream"? What are the implications of student

identification with a special program? How can the potential stigma of identification be counteracted?

4. What role should the faculty play in creating academic programs for students with special needs and interests? Should faculty members with special skills be sought out, or should all faculty who volunteer be invited to participate? Should faculty be rewarded for extra time or special creativity with regard to the program?

5. What is the rationale for special courses? What should the process and content look like? Are certain subjects and methods more interesting and effective with program students? If so, is there a process for reviewing "regular" courses in the light of this information?

IV. SUPPORT SERVICES

What we are designating as support services encompass the areas of tutoring, advising and counseling, housing, and specialized adjunct services. In different programs these "support services" were really integral parts of the total program and are somewhat difficult to separate out or isolate in any single fashion. In others, they were more clearly supportive to the program, serving to flesh out a basic thrust and purpose. The discussions following should serve to clarify these different program directions.

A. Academic Assistance (tutoring)

The bulk of academic assistance is in tutoring, although some programs, such as those at Cape Cod Community College and UMass (CCEBS) have variations on traditional "tutoring." Cape Cod has instituted a Study Skills Center staffed by 35 students. There is an hourly schedule of

available tutors for the 168 students who use this center. The tutors are regular college students, former program students, or community women (American Association of University Women). Each tutor goes through a nine-hour training course.

At Holyoke Community College a more traditional but a very comprehensive program is in operation. There are eight original faculty on the organization committee who volunteered to run the tutoring. They have been joined by 26 more faculty who have set up a tutoring system so that any student who asks for tutoring may get it. The director also has initiated a student tutoring program in which students from the Sigma Honor Society volunteer to do one-to-one tutoring with program students.

The University has a unique system of student tutors. There are 33 different departments within the University which have tutors. The total count is 68, about half minority students. These students come recommended by faculty and are screened by program staff. There is no specific training other than what the students learn from both the faculty and the program staff interviewing process. The students are paid $3.00 per hour for tutoring. In the beginning many of the tutors were graduate students; however, CCEBS initiated undergraduate tutors and use upper-division CCEBS students whenever possible. In addition to these 68 tutors are 10 tutorial monitors who are CCEBS students. They coordinate the CCEBS

tutees and the student tutors and give feedback to the CCEBS staff.

Tutoring is done in some fashion at every college either by faculty, students, graduate students, or a selection from each group. Some are paid, others volunteer. Most often the students are recommended by faculty within the specific department and are then used by the program according to need. Some of the students are trained, some are not. The final breakdown comes in how the tutoring program is organized, either as a tutorial center, or on an "on-call basis" for students as the specific need arises.

As regards tutoring, the following would seem to be indicated:

1. Tutoring ought to be available in all areas at any time during college.
2. Students respond best to tutoring when it is offered as a service rather than a requirement.
3. Evidence supports the motivational value of seeing former program students now in a position of competence. Former program students are probably better able to establish rapport than faculty members or graduate students.
4. When students are paid, there is some measure of control over their activities. Paying by the hour rather than by the semester makes sense.
5. Participation of both students and faculty in tutoring

in at least one instance (Cape Cod Community College) appeared to be a promising vehicle for building community.

B. Advising and Counseling

The advising and counseling of program students is given a different status and function within the various programs. In some there is a separation of some or all counseling/advising functions from the program proper. In others there is use of already existing facilities and personnel, and in still others there is integration of all or part of the counseling/advising process into the program.

Among the eleven programs studied, advising and counseling services were provided in the following areas:

1. Pre-program interviewing and counseling
2. Orientation
3. Course selection and placement
4. Academic and personal assistance
5. Personal counseling
6. Vocational and placement counseling

It often was the case that academic advising (interviewing, course selection, and placement) was done by the program directors. At Quinsigamond Community College, Mrs. Margaret Watson, the director, interviewed each person who was referred. (There were no applicants to the program who referred themselves; they were all "brought by someone else.") She did not rely on test scores or academic records, but accepted people who had a strong desire for more education and who would not normally have access to college. For students who enrolled this fall, Mrs. Watson had provided tutors, as the need had arisen, and

had counseled students on academic choices. Otherwise students were on their own (aside from her assistance in arranging for financial aid). Five or six counselors are available to the entire college, although Mrs. Watson felt that a black and a Spanish-speaking counselor were needed.

At Northern Essex Community College, the academic advising is done through Sheila Shively (Discovery Project co-ordinator) and the faculty working with the Project. Since the ratio of faculty to students is so low (42/13) there is an awareness on the part of the faculty of the students' needs, at least academically. The faculty do an interesting exercise which helps them to assess what their counterparts are teaching and also keeps the focus on interdisciplinary learning. They regularly visit each others' classes and follow these visits up by a discussion.

Sheila names the counseling as the weakest part of the program. Because of the lack of funds, the Discovery students had to share the regular, over-worked counselors (four in the NECC counseling center). They hoped that one counselor would be hired for the next semester. Sheila said that these counselors were not really hired to do the deep kind of counseling that the Discover students needed. She said that often if neither she nor the counseling staff could handle the situation she would have to turn to a community psychiatrist.

Prior to the current year, no college-wide academic

advising system existed at Springfield Technical Community College. "Small Departments and a technical orientation made it easier for each department head to manage his own students." Therefore, systematic advising is as new for regular students as it is for Program students. Mr. William White, chairman of the Student Development Program acted as academic advisor for virtually all of the 150 program students. The role of the counselors as envisioned by the project proposal designed to:

1. Help the student identify his strengths as well as those weaknesses which stand in the way of self-improvement and acceptance. Counselors assist the students in making appropriate career and self-directional choices thus providing him with a more realistic basis for motivation.
2. Coordinate a tutorial program and assign a tutor in each subject area to Student Development Program.
3. Work closely with each teacher assigned to this program in a resource capacity and meet with other teachers involved in the program for mutual evaluations.

At Massasoit Community College, aside from personal involvement of the program director, counseling, advising, and other support services are channeled through regular college support personnel.

Bristol Community College provides a full-time counselor

for Project Success. Two full-time technical assistants in the learning labs aided project staff in academic assistance.

It is clear that Cape Cod Community College is giving special attention to the fifty freshman in its disadvantaged program far beyond what the other students at the college receive. They receive a great deal of counseling and advising help from upper classmen and faculty, much of it though the tutoring program.

Academic advising of Spring Project students at Greenfield Community College was done by the co-directors, who also provided intensive personal counseling for project students as part of their duties, separate from the regular counseling services provided by the college, although a referral system was also used. Students were admitted to the program following interviews with the program directors.

The Motivation to Education Program at North Shore Community College begins with an orientation which is two days long, instead of the usual afternoon or morning that the regular NSCC students have. The MEP orientation tries to have the students meet with each other on a less than formal basis by having parties, workshops on campus, groups off campus, along with the traditional academic orientation and a goal orientation of MEP students. Academic advising is included within the notion of the tutoring program. The director, however, does most of what might be called academic advising. The director considers the counseling part to be

the most important part of the program. There are two former students plus the equivalent of 1 3/4 full-time counselors, from the faculty and NSCC Counseling staff. The student counselors in preparing the orientation for 1971-72, took a psychology course and did some group process work.

Berkshire Community College has organized a weekly meeting between six peer counselors and 12 program students.

The CCEBS Program at the University has the most complex and far-reaching counseling/advising program. One staff member coordinates academic counseling, which is done mainly by University Faculty members who have volunteered to work within the program. Those students who have not yet chosen majors are advised by the coordinator.

The personal counseling component of CCEBS has a director and four graduate student supervisors for the 26 peer dorm counselors (spread throughout the campus according to CCEBS population density), four peer "commuter" counselors, and two professional counselors who are on call in the UMass Counseling Center.

The dormitory counselors meet a different counseling need than the professional counselors in the Counseling Center. The peer counselors serve as on-tap information and advising people who "know the ropes." Several of the counselors are minority students who provide a visible affinity for the CCEBS students. Whether or not the University dormitory counselors are CCEBS students, these counselors should be made aware of

the goals and orientations of the program so that they can help the program students when possible.

The purposes of the advising and counseling are to help the students adjust to a new environment, to have information available to them, and to provide a link between the students and the faculty and staff of the program.

C. Graduation and Placement (as applicable to UMass and North Shore Community College)

North Shore's MEP began in 1968 so few students have graduated. Two who have graduated from North Shore Community College went on to four-year institutions. A few were employed by a local electric plant.

The CCEBS program, which began in September, 1968, expects to have a graduating class of 60 students this year. At the present time with only 16 having graduated there is no alumni follow-up program. However, a few of the staff are currently in the process of developing such a program.

The sixteen who have graduated were mostly transfer students, though two were regular students and had accelerated in the CCEBS program. Twelve of these students are now in graduate schools. The breakdown of these students is as follows:

Majors	Graduate Schools
1 Engineering	6 in Education
2 Business	1 in Engineering
3 Education	2 in Law
10 Arts and Sciences	3 Unknown
16 Graduated	12 in Graduate Schools

Much work needs to be done to build up effective placement and follow-up services.

D. Housing (as applicable to UMass only)

Approximately 75% of the CCEBS students live at UMass in residence halls spread throughout the campus. There is no effort by the CCEBS program to house these students homogeneously; on the other hand the program is supportive of requests from CCEBS students to be housed together. Therefore, one can find both a dispersed CCEBS population and a concentrated one, the latter through the students' own initiative.

The increased number of minority students has prompted increased hiring of minority staff and dorm counselors. However small, this represents an instance of institutional response to new populations. In addition, there has also been a new area of activity which the CCEBS students themselves have initiated. The "Afro-Am Center" and "Ahora" are two of the few centers which have been established by minority students for their own activities. These centers have helped to produce heightened awareness of the minority student population on the Amherst campus. Increasingly, the academic departments have tried to incorporate into the established courses relevant material pertaining to disadvantaged or minority students.

E. Adjunct Services

Additional support for program students was developed at Greenfield Community College through the establishment of a revolving paperback library. At Bristol, learning labs, run by trained technicians, were established with such equipment

as adding machines and calculators and other audio-visual aids.

Quinsigamond found that transportation and child care were real problems for many women who wished to come to the college. The director hired a shuttlebus and established a Community Service Education Center. She used state funds to hire nursery school aids and materials. The Center became a focal point for the tutoring of adults as well as children. "Here the students on both programs meet, the 'disadvantaged' student tutoring the Spanish-speaking student in the English Language. Here, too, the students meet to eat their brown bag lunches. Here conferences are scheduled, between guidance counselor and advisee, between teacher and student, or between students and me."

It should also be noted here that many of the community colleges have generated community service, G.E.D. and other kinds of outreach programs to bring people in to the college in ways that may have direct or indirect tie-ins with the "disadvantaged" programs.

We would hope that one or many of the above services would be considered for any special program. As pointed out in one document, "The experience of a number of institutions has demonstrated that no single special service--recruitment, tutoring, special counseling, open admissions, special plans for retention of students, remedial programs, or innovative

curriculum--will by itself guarantee the success of the physically handicapped or disadvantaged student. To succeed, projects must be comprehensive; they must consider the entire life of the student."[1] In regard to the services of advising, counseling, or "support," it would appear that there are several intangible qualifications that are important to consider. First is that many directors find that there is a great need for highly qualified counselors, perhaps those who have worked with "disadvantaged" before. Also, that there be enough of these people so that each does not have an unmanageable case load. A high level of commitment and enthusiasm are important especially during the first year. Enthusiasm must be accompanied by a real sophistication rather than an idealistic naiveté.

V. FINANCIAL AID

Each community college provides a form of financial aid for its students. In some cases, part of the state money was used by the college to provide funding for financially "disadvantaged" students, whether or not they were involved in a special academic program. Some colleges combined state funds with federal work/study grants for this purpose. Others used state programs such as Welfare (WIN), the Veterans' funding (G.I. Bill), Vocational Education, and Massachusetts Rehabilitation

---

[1]Division of Student Special Services, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, HEW, "Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Institutions of Higher Education Program," (Application Information and Program Manual), p. 4.

to supplement the students' costs. In addition, federal Educational Opportunity grants (EOG) were obtained in several programs to fund students.

We found that there were three categories of financial aid within the ten community colleges and the University of Massachusetts:

A. Awarding a large number of small scholarships. At Springfield Technical Community College, for example, one hundred scholarships ($100 apiece) are given to students who have been recommended by department heads for this stipend. (The cost of attending STCC is about $350 per year for tuition and books).

B. Providing tuition and book costs, and in some cases a stipend for living expenses. At Northern Essex Community College The Discovery Program provides the complete $350 tuition/books cost plus a $15 bi-monthly allowance for welfare recipients. Quinsigamond provides tuition plus a year's grant of $90 for expenses in addition to work/study opportunities for all program students. For most of the colleges, federal Work/Study grants seem to be a good way to aid a student's commitment to his or her own education. A large percentage of the community colleges had work/study opportunities before the disadvantaged programs were instituted and so the coordination of work/study with the disadvantaged programs was fairly simple. In at least one institution, state funds were used to supplement federal Work/Study. At one of the colleges, the financial

aid officer stated what we felt was a valid caution concerning work/study monies. Some students cannot or should not have to hold a work/study job at the same time that they are obtaining a degree. When these instances occur, the college should be able to support the student with the necessary funding.

C. Paying for all of a student's expenses, including tuition, books, room and board. The CCEBS program at the University of Massachusetts has given total support to each of its students. The amount of support was determined according to each student's individual needs (averaging around $1900 per year). This much more massive commitment represents the difference between the University's four or five year degree program, as opposed to the two-year associate degree, and the greater expense of its residence halls fees as opposed to the cost of housing in the local community.

It seems clear that various programs will need to develop guidelines for providing financial aid. Some basic questions are:

1. How can the institution strike a balance between efficient use of funds, maximum numbers of students and high quality of education?
2. Does the college need to guarantee enough money for every program student to meet his financial needs?
3. If so, doesn't this limit the size of the program and therefore its impact on the college and community?

4. What is the optimum number of students needed to build a cohesive community which can provide support for each other as well as energy to build the program?
5. Is a cohesive group that important, or should money be distributed in smaller, uniform amounts (e.g., paying tuition fees only) as an enticement for larger numbers to come in?
6. Should students be expected to work for part or all of the funds provided through the college?

Most feedback we have received from financial officers, program directors, and counselors leads us to the following recommendations:

A. Programs should admit only as many students as can be guaranteed as much support as they need for as long as it will take to reach their educational objective.

B. The level of support must be negotiated for each individual, since no two people can have exactly the same needs (this may present difficulties for students whose parents may not know how to fill out forms, or may be afraid to volunteer the necessary data; welfare programs may threaten to stop support if recipients are financed as students).

C. The college should seek some level of student commitment to paying for his education. To this end, the college should be able to facilitate bank loans or work/study employment if needed.

D. A formula should be devised to determine how many

students can be admitted. For example:

$$\frac{\text{No. to be admitted}}{\text{Total \$ available}} \quad \text{Program cost per student (based on average percent of total cost borne by the program)}$$

VI. STAFFING

Staffing has proved to be a problem at most schools in that it was limited to one director, who was often part-time and whose main responsibilities were either teaching or being part of programs seen as complimentary to special service programs; e.g., Community Services, Continuing Education, and Study and Learning Skills. Those schools whose director had sole or main responsibility to the program felt this strengthened the program. At UMass the Director, a full-time faculty member, oversees the operation. There are approximately 20 full-time staff, with a supporting part-time staff of 37 (including graduate students, CCEBS students, and part-time faculty).

All schools felt there should be a full-time staff whose sole responsibility is to the program. If size and/or budget are limiting, it is advised that the director be full-time rather than utilizing multiple part-time personnel. The total institution must be oriented to the role of part-time service of the program.

Many schools found a need for a program information analyst; those that had one found the services helpful. It was found that greater demands for information and statistics

were made of these programs than most others functioning at the institution.

VII. PLANNING AND POLICY MAKING

There were three modes of student "ownership" in the community colleges.

1. No student input either in the planning or operation of the program.
2. Students helped to plan the program.
3. Students have periodic feedback sessions with program staff and faculty at Holyoke Community College. This was often initiated by students. Where student input took place, student needs were adjusted to and met where possible. Cooperation and involvement was furthered.

UMass has extensive student participation in the CCEBS program. It might be helpful to describe the CCEBS governance and functioning system before describing student input.

CCEBS--The Committee for the College Education of Black Students--was started by 40 Black faculty and staff at UMass. The Committee functions as a program developer on the campus, especially as an advocate among faculty and administrators.

The Committee elects 11 of its members to the CCEBS Board. Four students, elected by students, presently sit on the Board. The Chairman of the Board is the President of the Committee. His function is one of overseer of staff operations--the staff has

much authority and autonomy delegated to it. The Board runs the program and sets policy which is carried out by the staff component functioning fairly autonomously.

The Board composition will be changing shortly to consist of 6 Committee members, 6 students, and 6 parents (3 Boston, 3 Springfield) elected by themselves. Two of each category will be elected every year for three-year terms.

Besides student involvement on the Board, many students are involved in the day-to-day functioning. All students are encouraged to work on some part of the program, providing it will not interfere with their academic success. Two students are staff component directors; one of Business and Finance, the other of the Newsletter. Students are also staff members, tutors, counselors, recruiters, and initiators of program aspects or off-shoots (Afro-Am Dept.).

Effectiveness of serving needs was highest where student-faculty feedback sessions took place, where programs were flexible enough to make changes as a result of input, where there existed a broad base of involvement, and where leadership proved responsive to all concerned elements.

VIII. FUNDING

Besides the directly allocated state funds for disadvantaged programs, several alternatives have been used to generate additional funds. There are sources in State and Federal programs and in private foundations.

Sources of additional state funding used to supplement programs have been:

1. Massachusetts Rehabilitation
2. Vocational Education funds
3. WIN and Welfare (students are drawn from WIN and thus bring some support with them)

Federal funding opportunities were used by several colleges:

1. Title I (Greenfield)
2. EOG (Bristol, Holyoke, Massasoit, Middlesex)
3. Title III (Cape Cod)
4. Title IV
5. Welfare Assistance Program (Massasoit)
6. OE/Model Cities (North Shore)
7. Work/Study (Bristol, Cape Cod, Greenfield, Middlesex, Springfield)

An additional method of gaining funds from the state is through requesting matching grants for monies secured through federal and/or foundation grants. UMass has used this leverage with the General Assembly, and Massasoit has used this in its requests for part of the State Disadvantaged Funds.

Specific Recommendations

Our original intent was to gather helpful descriptive information about ongoing programs and, if possible, augment it with the hard earned wisdom of some of those who have struggled with these programs. We had intended that the report should be instructive and directive only by implication. We now realize that we have gone beyond the scope of our intent and at this point see no further violation in our making forthright recommendations as regards particular aspects of program organization and management.

1. If colleges are to become effective self-critics, systematic feedback must be built into programs for the "disadvantaged" from the beginning. By methodically seeking reactions from all involved directly or peripherally--faculty, tutors, counselors, and student clienteles--program managers can obtain early identification of strengths and weakness in structure, operations, and affect. Further, if such feedback is to serve a useful purpose, sufficient power must be vested in the program director to assure his capacity for implementing and monitoring the changes that feedback directs.

2. If the programs are to provide access to those who never think to knock at the college door, the avenues of contact with these populations must be cultivated and sensitized. Existing social and educational agencies can be helpful, but only if thoroughly briefed on program goals and given a full understanding of what target populations the program seeks to identify.

3. Because the re-orientation of attitudes and the restructuring of responses of an entire college are the ultimate goals, the need for deliberate programs of orientation and training for all faculty is self-evident. Colleges must take pains to be sure that all agenices of the college coming in contact with new student populations (e.g., counseling, academic advising, financial aid) have personnel with knowledge of, sensitivity to, and gentle willingness to live with cultural differences. Every point of contact with the institution can be positively or negatively wired, depending upon the judicious choice and careful training of personnel.

4. It is important that institutions refrain from presuming what living arrangements are best suited to new populations. Logistical considerations cannot be allowed to take precedence over freedom of choice on the part of students. Whatever the merits of total integration, institutions must stand ready to support and facilitate the request of any student group that seeks the comfort and security of living together.

5. The responsibility of the college goes beyond diagnosis. It extends to the responsibility for helping each student learn how to assess his own needs and to discover and perfect his best learning style.

6. For students without a history of success it is important to establish milestones of achievement within their range of vision (e.g., the A.A. degree upon completion of lower division work, possibly certificates or other statements attesting to the level of competency achieved).

7. In a four-year college the possibility of academic dismissal should come no sooner than the end of the second year.

Issues and Exploratory Questions

Clearly, one criterion for evaluating state funded collegiate programs for the "disadvantaged" is their efficacy in bringing about institutional change. Such programs must make manifest (1) a re-orientation of attitude at every level of planning and operation to create a climate hospitable to the presence of new populations, and (2) an enlarged and enhanced response capacity that guarantees the delivery of the kinds and amounts of educational services required by these new populations on the campus.

That we know this is neither here nor there. How we came to know this, however, is very much to the point. We did not come to know by being told. Indeed, such insights were shared with us by some of those with whom we talked in the course of this survey. Being told led only to "academic" knowing, which is not enough. A fuller appreciation of how programs for the "disadvantaged" and institutional change are inextricably bound up really blossomed only when we stopped taking anything for granted. We examined meaning; we challenged assumptions.

Our own experience with this as a process leads us to proffer it as a means for re-orienting institutional attitudes. We are submitting below a partial list of issues or exploratory

questions, which may serve as a point of departure for discussions among staff and faculty members in a college who are planning to implement programs for "disadvantaged" students. We are quite prepared to have them dismissed by some as simplistic. We realize that others will be engaged as advocates rather than enquirers. To the extent that these behaviors exist, the first and necessary step toward attitudinal change will be frustrated.

We call our questions exploratory because, while not being certain that there are any clear-cut answers, we believe that raising them and dealing with them has enlarged our understanding of and tempered our attitudes toward the problem at hand. We suggest that they might do the same for others.

1. The Stigma of Language -- We share the widespread dissatisfaction with the term "disadvantaged." We have been unable to find a satisfactory alternative, but in seeking one we acquired an awareness of how language not only reflects but shapes our attitudes. In an undertaking where affect is crucial the language we use needs critical examination.

2. "Collegiate Level" Work -- Success in college is measured by the accumulation of credits. In our survey of programs we found that some institutions offered no credit for "sub-college" work. What are the identifiable characteristics that separate college from sub-college work? If a college offers a particular kind of instruction, does it not

follow that the kind of instruction offered is one of the things which that college is about? Is there some cut-off point in difficulty which separates that which can be rewarded (given credit) from that which cannot? How does Jerome Bruner's assertion (that anyting, properly structured, can be taught to anyone at any age) inform on the locus of the cut-off point, if the difficulty of the subject matter is indeed the criterion?

3. What support services for whom -- Efforts to offer support services that engender academic success with dignity would appear to be limited to programs for the "disadvantaged." For instance, college sponsored tutorial programs occurred with high frequency among the programs we surveyed.

The demonstrated success of these programs recommends them as potentially powerful vehicles for skill building and closing the gap between individual performance and institutional expectations. Such vehicles should be examined for their effectiveness for serving the needs of all populations, not just the atypical.

4. Legitimizing Diversity -- Both philosophically and practically the introduction of new populations to the public college campus is in conflict with the traditional view of public education in the role of defender and preserver of the status quo. If America is beyond the melting pot, if as a nation we are committed not only to tolerate but to value diversity, what then does higher education preserve and defend?

If those who lead and manage institutions are no longer the sole decision makers in determining the goals and mission of that institution, how can more comprehensive participation in decision making be made to work? If institutions are to honor their commitment to diversity, they must accept as legitimate a myriad of individual goals. What are the criteria for sorting out those goals which are legitimate and those which are inappropriate? How many things can a college be about without tearing itself apart?

5. The Expanded Campus -- New answers to questions about who the students are and how they learn forces the question of where the boundaries of the campus are. How well can a single quadrangle, essentially in isolation, serve the end of diversity? Urban universities perennially boast of the wealth of educational resources just beyond their gates. How can these resources be harnessed and fully utilized by higher education? How can this process be used to destroy the dichotomy between the campus, which to many students is like another country, and the peculiar social milieu which is the student's native land? Can the student be the bridge with traffic flow in both directions, not only carrying the college into his community, but bringing rich and diverse resources into the quadrangle?